UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,059	04/20/2001	Virgil Flores Tordera	50R4628	2330

7590 05/06/2004

John L. Rogitz
Rogitz & Associates
Suite 3120
750 B Street
San Diego, CA 92101

EXAMINER	
PHAN, HUY Q	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2685	4

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/839,059	TORDERA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Huy Q Phan	2685	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 March 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,8-14 and 17-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,8-14 and 17-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernard (US-5,675,524) in view of Dent (US-6,529,707).

Regarding claim 1, Bernard discloses in figures 2-4, a communication interface device (100), comprising: a base (col. 2, lines 66-67); at least one receptacle (col. 3, lines 1-5) on the base configured for receiving a portion of a personal digital assistant (PDA) (102) therein; at least one connector (60) on the base configured for electrically communicating with the PDA; and at least one wireless Internet packet (IP) transceiver (112 and 124) supported by the base (col. 7, lines 10-23). But, Bernard fails to explicitly show at least one directional antenna mounted on the base and electrically connected to the transceiver. However in analogous art, Dent teaches a communication interface device comprising at least one directional antenna mounted on the base and electrically connected to the transceiver (col. 2, lines 51-63). Since, Bernard and Dent are related to the communication interface device; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Bernard by specifically having at least one directional antenna mounted on the base

and electrically connected to the transceiver as taught by Dent for purpose of transmitting/receiving signal from a direction of desired wave in order to improve the quality and reliability of wireless communication system.

Regarding claim 2, Bernard and Dent disclose a communication interface device as recited in the rejection of claim 1. But, Bernard and Dent do not particularly disclose wherein the wireless transceiver operates at a frequency of at least two thousand three hundred million Hertz. However, it is well known in the art for using a wireless transceiver, which can operate at a frequency of at least two thousand three hundred million Hertz. Therefore, at the time of the invention is made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to especially apply the wireless transceiver operates at a frequency of at least two thousand three hundred million Hertz into the system of Bernard and Dent, in order to provide the communication interface device of capability operating at high frequency.

Regarding claim 3, Bernard and Dent disclose a communication interface device as recited in prior rejections. But, Bernard and Dent fail to expressly recite wherein the wireless transceiver operates at a frequency of no more than two thousand three hundred ten million Hertz. However, it is well known in the art for using a wireless transceiver, which can operate at a frequency of no more than two thousand three hundred ten million Hertz, in order to make available for the communication interface device of capability operating at low frequency.

Regarding claim 4, Bernard and Dent disclose a communication interface device as recited in the rejection of claim 1. Bernard also discloses wherein the connector (60) being a serial bus connector (col. 4, lines 9-10).

Regarding claim 5, Bernard and Dent disclose a communication interface device as recited in the rejection of claim 1. Bernard discloses the device further comprising at least one light emitting diode (LED) (73) mounted on the base and operable at least to indicate whether the transceiver being communicating with a base station (col. 3, lines 62-63).

Regarding claim 8, Bernard and Dent disclose a communication interface device as recited in the rejection of claim 1. Bernard discloses in figure 6, a communication interface device (100), further comprising at least one audio speaker (330) on the base (col. 10, line 1).

Regarding claim 9, Bernard and Dent disclose a communication interface device as recited in the rejection of claim 1. Bernard discloses the device (100), further comprising at least one battery (col. 5, lines 4-5) included in the base.

Regarding claim 10, Bernard and Dent disclose a communication interface device as recited in prior rejections. Bernard discloses further comprising at least one

audio or visual (71) indication of a low voltage condition of the battery (col. 3, lines 62-63).

Regarding claim 11, Bernard and Dent disclose a communication interface device as recited in prior rejections. Bernard discloses further comprising at least one charger (148) port on the base and electrically connected to the battery (146) (col. 5, lines 4-7).

Regarding claim 12, Bernard and Dent disclose a communication interface device as recited in the rejection of claim 1. Bernard discloses further comprising a personal digital assistant (PDA) (102) engageable with the base.

3. Claims 13-21 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernard in view of Kay (US-5,930,704).

Regarding claims 13 and 27, Bernard discloses in figures 2-4, a wireless communication device (100) for providing at least one communication interface to a portable computer (102), comprising: holder means (col. 3, lines 1-12) for closely receiving the computer; electrical connection means (60) on the holder means for establishing electrical contact with the computer when the computer is held by the holder means; and wireless IP transceiver means (112 and 124) on the holder means for establishing a communication pathway between the computer and a wireless IP network when the computer is held by the holder means (col. 5, lines 50-57). But

Bernard dose not expressly disclose wherein the wireless transceiver means operating in a frequency range of between two thousand three hundred million Hertz and two thousand three hundred ten million Hertz (2300 mHz-2310 mHz) inclusive. However, Kay teaches in figure 1, a communication system wherein the wireless transceiver means (20) operating in a frequency range of between two thousand three hundred million Hertz and two thousand three hundred ten million Hertz (2300 mHz-2310 mHz) (col. 6, lines 33-35). Since, both Bernard and Kay are related to wireless communication systems; therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Bernard by specially having the wireless transceiver means operating in a frequency range of between two thousand three hundred million Hertz and two thousand three hundred ten million Hertz (2300 mHz-2310 mHz) as taught by Kay for purpose of permitting wireless communication system to operate in such specially frequency bandwidth.

Regarding claim 14, Bernard and Kay disclose all the limitations of claim 13. Bernard further discloses in figure 4, a wireless communication device (100) comprising an antenna (122) on the holder means and connected the wireless IP transceiver means.

Regarding claim 17, Bernard and Kay disclose all the limitations of claim 13. Bernard further discloses in figure 3, a wireless communication device (100) comprising at least one visual indicating means (73) mounted on the holder means for indicating

whether the transceiver means is communicating with a base station (col. 3, lines 62-63).

Regarding claim 18, Bernard and Kay disclose all the limitations of claim 13. Bernard further discloses in figure 4, a wireless communication device (100) comprising at least one audio (330) indicating means on the holder means.

Regarding claim 19, Bernard and Kay disclose all the limitations of claim 13. Bernard further discloses in figure 4, a wireless communication device (100) comprising at least one power (146) means included in the holder means.

Regarding claim 20, Bernard and Kay disclose all the limitations of claim 19. Bernard further discloses in figure 3, a wireless communication device (100) comprising at least one audio or visual indication (71) of a low voltage condition of the power means (col. 3, lines 62-63).

Regarding claim 21, Bernard and Kay disclose all the limitations of claim 20. Bernard further discloses in figure 4, a wireless communication device (100) comprising at least one charger (148) means on the holder and electrically connected to the power (146) means (col. 5, lines 4-7).

4. Claims 22-26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernard.

Regarding claim 22, Bernard discloses in figures 2-4, a method for establishing wireless IP communication between a portable computer (102) and at least one base station (col. 2, lines 38-39), comprising: providing a cradle (100) configured for closely receiving the computer (102), the cradle including at least one connector (60); providing at least one IP transceiver (112 and 124) in the cradle (col. 7, lines 10-23), the IP transceiver being electrically connected to the connector, whereby IP communication is established between the base station and computer when the computer is engaged with the cradle (col. 2, lines 30-39). But Bernard fails expressly show displaying on the computer, at least one icon representing the cradle. However, it is known in the art for displaying on the computer, an icon representing such a program, a software, a subject, a product; therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Bernard by specially displaying on the computer, at least one icon representing the cradle for purpose of allowing quick, user friendly accessing of cradle information.

Regarding claim 23, Bernard discloses in figure 2, a method for establishing wireless IP communication as recited in the rejection of claim 22, further comprising providing a visual indication (73) on the cradle representative of a status of IP communication (col. 3, lines 62-63).

Regarding claim 24, Bernard discloses in figure 6, a method for establishing wireless IP communication according to claim 22, further comprising providing an audio indication (330) on the cradle representative of a status of IP communication (col. 10, lines 1-4).

Regarding claim 25, Bernard discloses in figure 4, a method for establishing wireless IP communication according to claim 22, further comprising providing a rechargeable power supply (146) in the cradle (col. 5, lines 1-7).

Regarding claim 26, Bernard discloses in figures 1 and 4, a method for establishing wireless IP communication as recited in the rejection of claim 25, further comprising providing a charging jack (col. 5, lines 5-6) on the base electrically connected to the power supply (146).

Regarding claim 28, Bernard discloses all limitations as applied in prior rejections of all claimed subject matters. But Bernard fails to explicitly recited wherein the wireless transceiver means operates in a frequency range of between nine kiloHertz and fifty gigaHertz (9 kHz-50 gHz), inclusive. However, it is well known in the art for using a wireless transceiver, which operates in a frequency range of between nine kiloHertz and fifty gigaHertz (9 kHz-50 gHz). Therefore, at the time of the invention is made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to especially apply the wireless transceiver operates in a frequency range of between nine kiloHertz and fifty gigaHertz

(9 kHz-50 gHz) into the system of Bernard, in order to allow wireless communication system to operate widely at broad frequency bandwidth.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 8-14 and 17-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy Q Phan whose telephone number is 703-305-9007. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Urban F Edward can be reached on 703-305-4385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HP
Apr. 26, 2004

EDWARD F. [illegible]
SUPERVISORY PATENT [illegible]
TECHNOLOGY C[illegible]